

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

IN RE: YASMIN AND YAZ)	
(DROSPIRENONE) MARKETING, SALES)	3:09-md-02100-DRH-PMF
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY)	
LITIGATION)	MDL No. 2100

This Document Relates to:

Shivanthi Ahendran v. No. 3:12-cv-10573-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Heather E. Auxier v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:12-cv-10530-DRH-PMF

Kirsti A. Bryson v. No. 3:12-cv-10113-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Ashley Summer Dawson v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:12-cv-10527-DRH-PMF

Sarah Gross v. No. 3:12-cv-20092-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Janet Hunsinger v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:12-cv-10160-DRH-PMF

Shaeleshni Lata v. No. 3:12-cv-10014-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Latisha Morrell v. No. 3:12-cv-10470-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

ORDER DISMISSING WITH PREJUDICE

HERNDON, Chief Judge:

This matter is before the Court on the defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc.'s motion, pursuant to Case Management Order 12 ("CMO 12"), for an order dismissing the plaintiffs' claims, in the above-captioned

matters, with prejudice for failure to comply with Plaintiff Fact Sheet (“PFS”) obligations.

On September 26, 2012, Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc. moved to dismiss the above captioned matters without prejudice for failure to comply with PFS obligations. The Court granted the motion on December 4, 2012.

In the order dismissing the above captioned actions, the Court warned the plaintiffs that, “pursuant to CMO 12 Section E, **unless plaintiffs serve defendants with a COMPLETED PFS or move to vacate the dismissal without prejudice within 60 days after entry of this Order, the Order will be converted to a Dismissal With Prejudice upon defendants’ motion.**”

On March 28, 2013, approximately four months after the entry of the order of dismissal without prejudice, Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc. filed the subject motion stating the plaintiffs are still not in compliance with their PFS obligations and asking the Court to convert the dismissals to dismissals with prejudice pursuant to Section E of CMO 12,

To date, none of the above captioned plaintiffs have taken any steps to cure their PFS deficiencies, to address the without prejudice dismissal, or to reply to the motion for dismissal with prejudice. The plaintiffs have had ample time to cure the any PFS deficiencies and avoid a with prejudice dismissal.

Having considered the motion and the relevant provisions of CMO 12 the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

The plaintiffs in the above captioned actions have failed to comply with their obligations pursuant to CMO 12 and more than 60 days have passed since the entry of the order of dismissal without prejudice for failure to comply with CMO 12. Accordingly, pursuant to Section E of CMO 12, **the plaintiffs' complaints are hereby dismissed WITH prejudice.**

Further, the Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of the **Court to enter judgment reflecting the same.**

SO ORDERED:

 David R. Herndon
2013.06.18
13:12:47 -05'00'

Chief Judge
United States District Court

Date: June 18, 2013